UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,308	04/21/2004	Hiroko Mano	R2184.0311/P311	4787

24998 7590 12/21/2007		

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1825 EYE STREET NW
Washington, DC 20006-5403

EXAMINER
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/21/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _07 September 2007_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-9,13-21,25 and 26_ is/are pending in the application.

　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-9,13-21,25 and 26_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _21 April 2004_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.

　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-9, 13-21, 25 and 26 are rejected. Claims 10-12 and 22-24 have been

canceled.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7

September 2007 has been entered.

Priority

3.   Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which

papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

4.   The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show

bus 4 as described in the specification **[Applicant's Specification: page 9, line 20]**.

Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed

invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing

sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to

avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should

include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if

only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing

should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the

appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary,

the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief

description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement

sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each

drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top

margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If

the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and

informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the

drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6.   **Claims 1 and 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: a unit that allows a user to designate one of the selected documents.

7.   **Claims 13 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: a user designating one of the selected documents.

8.   **Claims 3-5 and 15-17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3 and 15 recite the phrase "a feature index/color table". It is unclear whether this term relates to a table that relates the feature index to colors or if the term is to be interpreted as a feature index table or a color table. It is suggested that the phrase be rewritten in a manner that excludes the slash and clearly depicts the meaning of the phrase.

Claims 4 and 16 recite the phrase "a feature index/gray scale table". It is unclear whether this term relates to a table that relates the feature index to a gray scale or if the term is to be interpreted as a feature index table or a gray scale table. It is

suggested that the phrase be rewritten in a manner that excludes the slash and clearly depicts the meaning of the phrase.

Claims 5 and 17 recite the phrase "a feature index/type face table". It is unclear whether this term relates to a table that relates the feature index to type faces or if the term is to be interpreted as a feature index table or a type face table. It is suggested that the phrase be rewritten in a manner that excludes the slash and clearly depicts the meaning of the phrase.

9.   To allow for compact prosecution, the examiner will apply prior art to these claims as best understood, with the assumption that applicant will amend to overcome the stated 112 rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

10.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

11.   **Claim 25** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 25 is directed to a computer program. A computer program is considered to represent software per se, and in this instance is merely functional descriptive material.

> MPEP 2106.01 [R-6]:
> Descriptive material can be characterized as either "functional descriptive material" or "nonfunctional descriptive material." In this context, "functional descriptive material" consists of data structures and computer programs which impart functionality when employed as a computer component. (The definition of "data structure" is "a physical or logical relationship among data elements, designed to support specific data manipulation functions." The New IEEE Standard Dictionary of Electrical and Electronics Terms 308 (5th ed. 1993).) "Nonfunctional descriptive material" includes but is not limited to music, literary works, and a compilation or mere arrangement of data.
>
> Both types of "descriptive material" are nonstatutory when claimed as descriptive material per se, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759. When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory in most cases since use of technology permits the function of the descriptive material to be realized. Compare In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 1583-84, 32 USPQ2d 1031, 1035 (Fed. Cir. 1994)(discussing patentable weight of data structure limitations in the context of a statutory claim to a data structure stored on a computer readable medium that increases computer efficiency) and >In re< Warmerdam, 33 F.3d *>1354,< 1360-61, 31 USPQ2d *>1754,< 1759 (claim to computer having a specific data structure stored in memory held statutory product-by-process claim) with Warmerdam, 33 F.3d at 1361, 31 USPQ2d at 1760 (claim to a data structure per se held nonstatutory).

Thus, it is required that the functional descriptive material be recorded on a computer readable medium. Claim 26, which is dependent on claim 25 recites "a computer readable recording medium storing the computer program as claimed in claim 25," and therefore if incorporated within claim 25, would overcome the rejection of claim 25.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by
another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent
granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the
applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section
351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States
only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

13.   Claims 1, 3, 7, 13, 15, 19, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as

being anticipated by US PGPub 2003/0050927 to Hussam (hereafter Hussam).

    Referring to claim 1, Hussam discloses a document retrieval apparatus,

comprising:

    · a query character string input unit that accepts an input of a query character

string including a plurality of retrieval keywords [entering the desired search terms] (see

[0077], lines 6-8; [0245], lines 6-10; and Fig 14);

    a document select unit that selects one or more documents that match the query

character string from a document database [compiles a subset or collection of

documents based upon the search terms or keywords selected] (see [0077], lines 8-10);

    a retrieval result output unit that presents retrieval results of the selected

documents to a user [presents the resulting collection of documents to the user; return

the list of found URLs] (see [0077], lines 10-11 and [0245], lines 11); and

    a document output unit that presents the contents of one of the selected

documents designated by the user [by 'clicking' on the pie chart icon, the Semantic

Highlighting tools will display color-coded highlighted terms within the retrieved HTML document; opening any URL will force SHIRE to retrieve that document from the sample pool of HTML documents on the SHIRE server] (see [0211], lines 3-6; [0245], lines 14-16);

wherein the document output unit determines a manner in which the retrieval keywords are highlighted in the presented one of the selected documents in accordance with a feature index indicating an extent to which each of the retrieval keywords has contributed to the selection of the documents [it starts by building a color-coded legend of search terms, and displaying the total number of hits per term; for each document in the hit list, it keeps track of the number of times the term occurred within the document, the sum of the number of hits of all terms in each document and the URL for that document] (see [0248], lines 3-7; and [0252]), and highlights the retrieval keywords [highlighting terms] in the presented one of the selected documents in the determined manner (see [0254]).

Referring to claim 3, Hussam discloses the document retrieval apparatus as claimed in claim 1, further comprising:

a feature index/color table [a color-coded legend of search terms] in which a corresponding relation of the feature index to a color is registered [a color is assigned to each term] (see [0208] and [0248], lines 3-7);

wherein the document output unit determines the color corresponding to the feature index of each retrieval keyword with reference to the feature index/color table, and displays the retrieval keyword using the determined color in a different manner from

a manner in which other words are displayed [the content script decodes the search string and breaks the search string into individual terms in order to be able to highlight each term with a unique color within the document body; it starts the actual process of highlighting terms by iterating over all terms] (see [0254]).

Referring to claim 7, Hussam discloses the document retrieval apparatus as claimed in claim 1, further comprising:

a ranking unit that ranks the retrieval keywords included in the selected documents in accordance with a feature index indicating an extent to which each retrieval keyword has contributed to the selection of the selected documents (see [0248], lines 3-7 and [0252]);

wherein the document output unit, when highlighting the retrieval keywords in the determined manner, displays the result of the ranking with the contents of one of the selected documents (see [0252] and [0254]).

Referring to claim 13, Hussam discloses a method of retrieving documents, comprising the steps of:

accepting an input of a query character string including a plurality of retrieval keywords [entering the desired search terms] (see [0077], lines 6-8; [0245], lines 6-10; and Fig 14);

selecting one or more documents that match the query character string from a document database [compiles a subset or collection of documents based upon the search terms or keywords selected] (see [0077], lines 8-10);

presenting retrieval results of the selected documents to a user [presents the

resulting collection of documents to the user; return the list of found URLs] (see [0077],

lines 10-11 and [0245], lines 11); and

presenting the contents of one of the selected documents designated by the user

[by 'clicking' on the pie chart icon, the Semantic Highlighting tools will display color-

coded highlighted terms within the retrieved HTML document; opening any URL will

force SHIRE to retrieve that document from the sample pool of HTML documents on the

SHIRE server] (see [0211], lines 3-6; [0245], lines 14-16);

wherein the document output unit determines a manner in which the retrieval

keywords are highlighted in the presented one of the selected documents in accordance

with a feature index indicating an extent to which each of the retrieval keywords has

contributed to the selection of the documents [it starts by building a color-coded legend

of search terms, and displaying the total number of hits per term; for each document in

the hit list, it keeps track of the number of times the term occurred within the document,

the sum of the number of hits of all terms in each document and the URL for that

document] (see [0248], lines 3-7; and [0252]), and highlights the retrieval keywords

[highlighting terms] in the presented one of the selected documents in the determined

manner (see [0254]).

Referring to claim 15, Hussam discloses the method as claimed in claim 13,

wherein a color corresponding to the feature index of each retrieval keyword is

determined with reference to a feature index/color table [a color-coded legend of search

terms] in which a corresponding relation of the feature index to a color is registered [a

color is assigned to each term] (see [0208] and [0248], lines 3-7), and the retrieval

keyword is displayed using the determined color in a different manner from a manner in

which other words are displayed [the content script decodes the search string and

breaks the search string into individual terms in order to be able to highlight each term

with a unique color within the document body; it starts the actual process of highlighting

terms by iterating over all terms] (see [0254]).

Referring to claim 19, Hussam discloses the method as claimed in claim 13,

further comprising the step of: ranking the retrieval keywords included in the selected

documents in accordance with a feature index indicating an extent to which each

retrieval keyword has contributed to the selection of the selected documents (see

[0248], lines 3-7; [0252]; and [0254]).

Referring to claim 25, Hussam discloses a computer program [application

program] that causes a computer to operate as the document retrieval apparatus as

claimed in claim 1 (see [0077]).

Referring to claim 26, Hussam discloses a computer readable recording

medium storing the computer program as claimed in claim 25 (see [0275]).

14.   **Claims 8, 9, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being**

anticipated by US PGPub 2004/0034629 to Genser (hereafter Genser).

Referring to claim 8, Genser discloses a document retrieval apparatus,

comprising:

a query character string input unit that accepts an input of a query character

string including a plurality of retrieval keywords [Search term Entry Field] (see [0059],

lines 3-5 and Figs 5-7);

a document select unit that selects one or more documents that match the query

character string from a document database (see [0059], lines 10-11 and Figs 5-7);

a retrieval result output unit that presents retrieval results of the selected

documents to a user (see [0059], lines 10-11 and Figs 5-7); and

a document output unit that presents the contents of one of the selected

documents designated by the user (see [0059]);

wherein the query character string input unit allows a user to designate a word

other than the retrieval keywords [de-emphasize a word], the word can be highlighted

by the document output unit in the presented one of the selected documents (see

[0044], lines 10-12 and [0059], lines 11-15).

Referring to claim 9, Genser discloses the document retrieval apparatus as

claimed in claim 8, wherein the query character string input unit accepts a designation

[NOT] of a retrieval keyword that is not to be highlighted in the designated one of the

selected documents (see [0041], lines 7-8).

Referring to claim 20, Genser discloses a method of retrieving documents,

comprising the steps of:

accepting an input of a query character string including a plurality of retrieval

keywords [Search term Entry Field] (see [0059], lines 3-5 and Figs 5-7);

selecting one or more documents that match the query character string from a

document database (see [0059], lines 10-11 and Figs 5-7);

presenting retrieval results of the selected documents to a user (see [0059], lines

10-11 and Figs 5-7); and

presenting the contents of one of the selected documents designated by the user

(see [0059]);

wherein the query character string input unit allows a user to designate a word

other than the retrieval keywords [de-emphasize a word], the word can be highlighted

by the document output unit in the presented one of the selected documents (see

[0044], lines 10-12 and [0059], lines 11-15).

Referring to claim 21, Genser discloses the method as claimed in claim 20,

wherein a retrieval keyword that is not to be highlighted in the designated one of the

selected documents can be designated (see [0041], lines 7-8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

16.   Claims 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2003/0050927 to Hussam as applied respectively to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of US Patent No 5,787,421 to Nomiyama (hereafter Nomiyama).

Referring to claim 2, while Hussam discloses the feature index corresponding to

retrieval keywords including for each document in the hit list, keeping track of the

number of times the term occurred within the document (see [0248], lines 3-7), Hussam

fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of the index indicating the number of

selected documents including one of the retrieval keywords. Nomiyama discloses

collecting data on keywords contained in the documents retrieved by the keyword

retrieval engine, including the further limitation, wherein the feature index corresponding

to one of the retrieval keywords indicates the number of the selected documents

including one of the retrieval keywords [the number of documents containing individual

keywords] (see column 4, lines 7-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to substitute the number of documents containing individual keywords

disclosed by Nomiyama for the number of times the term occurred within the document

disclosed by Hussam. One would have been motivated to do so since both types of counts are well-known in the art for ranking retrieved documents for display.

Referring to claim 14, while Hussam discloses the feature index corresponding to retrieval keywords including for each document in the hit list, keeping track of the number of times the term occurred within the document (see [0248], lines 3-7), Hussam fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of the index indicating the number of selected documents including one of the retrieval keywords. Nomiyama discloses collecting data on keywords contained in the documents retrieved by the keyword retrieval engine, including the further limitation, wherein the feature index corresponding to one of the retrieval keywords indicates the number of the selected documents including one of the retrieval keywords [the number of documents containing individual keywords] (see column 4, lines 7-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to substitute the number of documents containing individual keywords disclosed by Nomiyama for the number of times the term occurred within the document disclosed by Hussam. One would have been motivated to do so since both types of counts are well-known in the art for ranking retrieved documents for display.

17.   **Claims 4 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US PGPub 2003/0050927 to Hussam as applied respectively to claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of US Patent No 6,094,651 to Agrawal et al (hereafter Agrawal).**

Referring to claim 4, while Hussam discloses the a feature index/color table [a color-coded legend of search terms] in which a corresponding relation of the feature index to a color is registered [a color is assigned to each term] (see [0208] and [0248], lines 3-7); wherein the document output unit determines the color corresponding to the feature index of each retrieval keyword with reference to the feature index/color table, and displays the retrieval keyword using the determined color in a different manner from a manner in which other words are displayed [the content script decodes the search string and breaks the search string into individual terms in order to be able to highlight each term with a unique color within the document body; it starts the actual process of highlighting terms by iterating over all terms] (see [0254]), Hussam fails to explicitly disclose the concept of a feature/index gray scale table instead of a feature/index color table. Agrawal discloses describing relative intensity of highlighting in terms of colors, including the further concept of replacing the colors with a grey scale (see column 4, lines 56-58).

It would have been obvious to replace the colors disclosed by Hussam with the grey scale of Agrawal. One would have been motivated to do so since grey scale is simply another means to attract the user's attention to some item or items of interest (Hussam: see [0012], lines 12-14).

Referring to claim 16, while Hussam discloses the a feature index/color table

[a color-coded legend of search terms] in which a corresponding relation of the feature

index to a color is registered [a color is assigned to each term] (see [0208] and [0248],

lines 3-7); wherein the document output unit determines the color corresponding to the

feature index of each retrieval keyword with reference to the feature index/color table,

and displays the retrieval keyword using the determined color in a different manner from

a manner in which other words are displayed [the content script decodes the search

string and breaks the search string into individual terms in order to be able to highlight

each term with a unique color within the document body; it starts the actual process of

highlighting terms by iterating over all terms] (see [0254]), Hussam fails to explicitly

disclose the concept of a feature/index gray scale table instead of a feature/index color

table. Agrawal discloses describing relative intensity of highlighting in terms of colors,

including the further concept of replacing the colors with a grey scale (see column 4,

lines 56-58).

It would have been obvious to replace the colors disclosed by Hussam with the

grey scale of Agrawal. One would have been motivated to do so since grey scale is

simply another means to attract the user's attention to some item or items of interest

(Hussam: see [0012], lines 12-14).

18.   **Claims 5, 6, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being**

unpatentable over US PGPub 2003/0050927 to Hussam as applied respectively to

claims 1 and 13 above, and further in view of US PGPub 2004/0175036 to Graham

(hereafter Graham).

       Referring to claim 5, while Hussam discloses the a feature index/color table [a

color-coded legend of search terms] in which a corresponding relation of the feature

index to a color is registered [a color is assigned to each term] (see [0208] and [0248],

lines 3-7); wherein the document output unit determines the color corresponding to the

feature index of each retrieval keyword with reference to the feature index/color table,

and displays the retrieval keyword using the determined color in a different manner from

a manner in which other words are displayed [the content script decodes the search

string and breaks the search string into individual terms in order to be able to highlight

each term with a unique color within the document body; it starts the actual process of

highlighting terms by iterating over all terms] (see [0254]), Hussam fails to explicitly

disclose the concept of a feature/index gray scale table instead of a feature/index color

table. Graham discloses highlighting terms, including the further concept of using

different type face [font sizes] instead of using different colors to highlight text (see

[0119]).

       It would have been obvious to replace the colors in the table disclosed by

Hussam with the different font sizes disclosed by Graham. One would have been

motivated to do so since type face is simply another means to attract the user's

attention to some item or items of interest (Hussam: see [0012], lines 12-17).

Referring to claim 6, the combination of Hussam and Graham (hereafter Hussam/Graham) discloses the document retrieval apparatus as claimed in claim 5, wherein the type face includes at least one of font, size [font size], and style of a character (see [0119]).

Referring to claim 17, while Hussam discloses the a feature index/color table [a color-coded legend of search terms] in which a corresponding relation of the feature index to a color is registered [a color is assigned to each term] (see [0208] and [0248], lines 3-7); wherein the document output unit determines the color corresponding to the feature index of each retrieval keyword with reference to the feature index/color table, and displays the retrieval keyword using the determined color in a different manner from a manner in which other words are displayed [the content script decodes the search string and breaks the search string into individual terms in order to be able to highlight each term with a unique color within the document body; it starts the actual process of highlighting terms by iterating over all terms] (see [0254]), Hussam fails to explicitly disclose the concept of a feature/index gray scale table instead of a feature/index color table. Graham discloses highlighting terms, including the further concept of using different type face [font sizes] instead of using different colors to highlight text (see [0119]).

It would have been obvious to replace the colors in the table disclosed by Hussam with the different font sizes disclosed by Graham. One would have been motivated to do so since type face is simply another means to attract the user's attention to some item or items of interest (Hussam: see [0012], lines 12-17).

Referring to claim 18, Hussam/Graham discloses the method as claimed in claim 17, wherein the type face includes at least one of font, size [font size], and style of a character (see [0119]).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly Lovel whose telephone number is (571) 272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

19 December 2007
kml

JOHN COTTINGHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100